
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH

THEODORE MOFFITT and PATRICIA
MOFFITT,
Plaintiffs,
v.
DESERT MESA CONSTRUCTION, LLC,
Defendant.

**MEMORANDUM DECISION AND
ORDER REGARDING SUBJECT-
MATTER JURISDICTION**

Case No. 4:19-cv-00019-DN

District Judge David Nuffer

On February 13, 2019, the Moffitts filed a Complaint¹ commencing this action based on diversity of citizenship under [28 U.S.C. § 1332\(a\)\(1\)](#). Although the Complaint alleged that “[t]he Moffitts are residents of the state of Arizona,” it made no allegation regarding their citizenship, based on their domicile (rather than mere residence).² As a result, on February 22, 2019, an Order to Show Cause re: Subject-Matter Jurisdiction (“OSC”)³ was entered requiring the Moffitts to “file an amended complaint containing allegations essential to show their respective citizenship” “by no later than Friday, March 1, 2019.”⁴ While the Moffitts timely filed an Amended Complaint,⁵ they failed to assert any new allegation to show their citizenship. Instead, they once again merely asserted that they “are residents of the state of Arizona.”⁶

¹ Complaint, [docket no. 2](#), filed February 13, 2019.

² *Id.* ¶ 1.

³ [Docket no. 8](#), filed February 22, 2019.

⁴ *Id.* at 2.

⁵ [Docket no. 9](#), filed February 26, 2019.

⁶ *Id.* ¶ 1.

On March 21, 2019, Defendant Desert Mesa Construction LLC (“DMC”) filed a Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Subject-Matter Jurisdiction (“SMJ Motion”)⁷ under [Fed. R. Civ. P. 12\(b\)\(1\)](#) “because the Amended Complaint fails to allege diversity of citizenship between citizens of different states.”⁸ While the Moffitts have not yet filed a response to the SMJ Motion, they filed a Second Amended Complaint⁹ on April 10, 2019, as is allowed under [Fed. R. Civ. P. 15\(a\)\(1\)\(B\)](#).

The Second Amended Complaint contains allegations sufficient to show the Moffitts’ citizenship for diversity purposes.¹⁰

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED as follows:

1. The OSC¹¹ is SATISFIED based on the allegations of the Second Amended Complaint.
2. The SMJ Motion⁷ is MOOT, and accordingly DENIED, based on the allegations of the Second Amended Complaint, which are sufficient to establish subject-matter jurisdiction in this diversity action.
3. In accordance with [Fed. R. Civ. P. 12\(a\)\(4\)\(A\)](#), DMC must serve a responsive pleading to the Second Amended Complaint by no later than *April 25, 2019*.

Signed April 11, 2019.

BY THE COURT:



David Nuffer
United States District Judge

⁷ [Docket no. 14](#), filed March 21, 2019.

⁸ *Id.* at 1.

⁹ [Docket no. 15](#), filed April 10, 2019.

¹⁰ See *id.* ¶¶ 3-4.

¹¹ [Docket no. 8](#), filed February 22, 2019.